

# Interview Summary

Application No.  
09/490,983

Applicant(s)  
Adachi et al

Examiner  
Ing-Hour Lin

Art Unit  
1725

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Ing-Hour Lin

(3) Mitsuru Adachi

(2) Richard Barth

(4) Tetsuo Okita And Tony Tanaka

Date of Interview Sep 24, 2003

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1

Identification of prior art discussed:

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Attorney agreed that the independent claim would be amended to include cooling rate so that no stirring process is required for controllint the grain shape and size in the shaping semisolid metals.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

J. H. Lin  
Examiner's signature, if required